

Trade in America 1778

THE
R E P L Y
OF A
G E N T L E M A N
IN A
SELECT SOCIETY,
The Society in which this Reply was delivered
was composed of men fully informed. This Society
met in the rooms of America; some which
IMPORTANT CONTEST
between
G R E A T B R I T A I N
AND
A M E R I C A.

L O N D O N:

PRINTED FOR J. ALMON, OPPOSITE BURLINGTON
HOUSE, PICCADILLY.

M DCC LXXV.

Э Н Т

Y E P T L Y

А М

И А М Е С С И С

А М

С П Л Б Г О Г С О С И Е Т

The Society, in which this Reply was delivered,
was composed of near fifty members. Three fourths
voted in favour of America; among which majority,
above two thirds were Gentlemen of the Law.

И П А Т И Д

А М

А С Я И С



T H E
R E P L Y, &c.

MR. PRESIDENT,

I Am not the author of the question before you, but I think it a good one. It is meant to involve that important controversy at this most alarming crisis—Are the Americans justifiable in their resistance to *unrepresented taxation*?—I think, that taxation and representation cannot be disunited. That such a disunion would be directly to murder the first principles of our happy constitution—That the right of representation is the very essence of that constitution—and to violate that right, is a step leading instantly to the dissolution of all government. We know, that the inhabitants of Great Britain cannot be taxed without being represented—An exertion so arbitrary would destroy the fundamental maxim of the British constitution. The Americans are not, and from the nature and situation of things, it is granted by

their enemies, that they cannot be represented in the British Parliament. Then, of course, to do that without representation, which, by the true intention of the constitution, requires the most perfect representation, is undoubtedly to violate that great, that important, that most essential right, upon which the liberties of these kingdoms must for ever depend — And when such rights are violated, Sydney, Mr. Locke, and the law of reason will tell us, that the practical dissolution of all government ought immediately to follow. I acknowledge with the Gentlemen, that protection and subjection are duties reciprocal. By protection we here mean the security of those rights and liberties which every member is entitled to by the dictates of the constitution — In our establishment this is the genuine meaning of the word protection. I acknowledge, that protection and subjection are duties reciprocal. But when the protecting power fails in his part of the original contract, the subject is no longer held to the condition of obedience, but of consequence falls back into the primary state of nature — The

liberty

liberty of such a state is to commence a new system of legislation. By this declaration I mean to say, that if the King of England will afford this sort of protection to his American subjects, those subjects are always ready to pay him obedience. But if the King of England will not afford this sort of protection to his American subjects, if he will not secure them from insults, from rapine, and oppression, if he will not cease to violate his coronation oath, then his American subjects will no longer pay him obedience, they will render him no subjection, they will begin a new system of civil and political regulations. The original contract is an ancient stipulation between the King and People; that if the sovereign will protect and secure to them the rights and liberties of his faithful subjects, they will not only pay him obedience, they will not only render him subjection, but they will do every thing in their power to make him a happy and a glorious monarch. Such a contract is founded in the good of society. It is therefore ultimately founded upon the laws of nature. But when the King is observed

observed to violate his coronation oath—when the king is observed to break his part of the contract, the contract is utterly undone, and the people have a right to begin *de novo*. This is the theory I mean to maintain—and this is the practice I *would* put into execution.

If the Americans are denominated British subjects by the Parliament of Great Britain, they are entitled to the privileges of British subjects. If they are not treated as British subjects, then it can be no rebellion in them to resist every disagreeable, inhuman, unnatural exertion from the mother country, or even from whatever royal hand it may come. What is commonly called British America, must either be a part of the British empire, or it must not. If it is, then the Americans go so far in constituting the whole of that empire. Under this supposition, it would be the most partial injustice, and even a rank solicitude in administration to oppress and destroy one part of the same body, and not extend them to the remainder also, when they are professedly denominated the same subjects, and of course must be obnoxious to

to the same government. If America is not a part of the British empire, that is, if the Americans are insulted, abused, harassed, and oppressed in such a manner, as to revert them to a state of nature, which, according to Mr. Hobbs, and according to right reason, is a state of war, then most assuredly the Americans have a right to act with spirit and resolution to their own security, to their own preservation, without incurring the odious offence or denunciation of rebels. These are rights and immunities which are granted them, confirmed and protected by natural justice, by positive compact, and by immemorial usage. I mean, Sir, that these are rights and immunities which are granted them by the God of Heaven, who has so ordained it from the foundation of things ; that they are confirmed by charters and solemn agreements ; and that they ought to be protected by that sacred usage, which commenced in our constitution beyond the memory of man. I think, that to defend and maintain these consecrated rights of America, is to defend and maintain their properties, their laws and customs, their lives,

lives, their liberties, their country, and the British constitution. To sacrifice and give them up, is to sacrifice themselves, their aged parents, their wives and children, the honours and sepulcres of their ancestors, the claims and blessings of posterity. We feel that there must be a general anxiety and resolution to retain to themselves whatever objects are so dear, so interesting to mankind. But if the Americans give way in a single instance, however minute that instance may be, who can answer, but in a little time, all those objects, though ever so dear, though ever so interesting, may be ravished from them. It is not the value of the money the Americans care for. One precedent creates another. In a momentary space they grow together, and are produced as law. They begin as matter of fact; they end as solid doctrine. The Romans were led from one precedent to another, from shades and gradations of mischief and wickedness, as at last not at all to be surprized or alarmed upon the total loss of all their liberties, and the subsequent destruction of the Roman Commonwealth. There is an awful duty

duty upon the Americans to preserve the rights and liberties which have been transmitted them from their ancestors—And without unnatural barbarity, they cannot suffer the dearest inheritance of their children to be destroyed or impaired.

It is now confirmed, Sir, by fatal experience, to be a thing impossible for the few ministers who govern, to entertain a sincere regard for the many people who are governed; or that the friends and hirelings of arbitrary power will not endeavour to fetter those men who would chuse to live and die in a free constitution. It is a point at present under disputation, whether the few at the helm of affairs in England can have any sincere regard for the many that are put under their protection in America. From the late occurrences in the British Parliament, we want no farther evidence to determine that question. Nor can we imagine but they will use every effort to enchain those Colonies of North America, which they falsely conceive have long been inclined to republican principles. For my own part, as a Scotchman said before me, and, by

the by, it was a rare phenomenon in a Scotchman, *I do profess a speculative predilection to that form of government*—But I am convinced the people of America would rather live under a mixed, under a limited monarchy, so constituted as ours, than under the most perfect republic that ever was established upon earth. At the same time, Sir, I have no doubt, and I speak it to the eternal honour of America, *that the manners of those brave people are wholly and strictly republican.*

The Gentlemen, my opponents, have made the basis of their argument to rest upon the destruction of the *tea* at Boston: that the Bostonians were highly to blame in destroying the tea; and that they ought to have made a compensation for it.— Sir, I hold that the Bostonians were not to blame in the destruction of the tea; and that they ought not to have made a compensation for it. The Bostonians were condemned without being represented, without being heard, without being tried in a legal manner, and even without any requisition on the part of the East India Company. Was it ever known under

Heaven,

Heaven, that an insignificant trespass upon private property, by thirty or forty persons, to be punished, in the first instance, with ships of war and armed men, with blood and destruction? The very question carries a decisive answer along with it—It never was known. Even from a foreign state there is always a demand of satisfaction made; when that satisfaction is denied, then it is judged time enough to put more forcible measures into execution. The East India Company well knew that tea was a particular commodity, illegally taxed to America, for the sole purpose of fixing a precedent of slavery upon those devoted people. They knew that the Americans had frequently remonstrated against that barbarous taxation—They knew that the Americans had associated against that barbarous taxation. The Company were conscious that it was altogether a ministerial manœuvre, to sound the virtue, the spirit, and activity of the Colonies—And they were conscious, that they themselves were the wretched tools and instruments of that manœuvre. We know that a certain renegado, one Gover-

nor Hutchinson, I think they call him, would not permit the teas to be sent back to England, as they were from New York and Philadelphia—And we know, that if the teas had been landed in Boston, they would have been consumed by the friends and mercenaries of Government, at least; and consequently, that the East India Company would not have met with that punishment which they so richly deserved for their sordid and mean-spirited insult upon American liberties. From this number of undeniable facts, it follows most incontrovertibly, that the Bostonians were not to blame in their destruction of the tea—And that they cannot make a compensation, without giving up the grand contest which they have so long supported with spirit and perseverance; and without acknowledging that the British Parliament *have a right to make statutes of sufficient validity to bind the Colonies in all cases whatsoever.*

Sir, you have been told this evening a great deal about American *independance*. I shall be happy to place that matter in its proper light. The Americans wish for that

that peaceable re-establishment of the political and commercial union between Great Britain and the Colonies, which existed and subsisted at the close of the last war. They think it an object most ardently to be wished for. They tell you so from the General Congress; they tell you so in every action of their lives. Have the Americans ever forfeited their title to veracity? I defy the Gentlemen to point me out a single instance in which the Americans, as a collective body, have deviated from the strictest laws of moral and political truth. To misrepresent a people at so great a distance, and upon a matter of the very first importance, where their properties, their lives, their liberties, and their constitution are at stake, is cruel, unjust, barbarous, and illiberal. The Colonies were planted upon these considerations; to disburden the mother country, over charged with inhabitants; upon the apprehension that so extensive a continent should fall into the hands of some other power; and upon the future prospect of commercial advantages, till those Colonies were in a situation to resist. But it never could

could enter into the head of any minister, who had common sense, or historical reading, or the uncorrupted feelings of human nature, but that those Colonies, whenever they came to a certain period, would and ought to assert their independency. It was upon this idea that the Colonies had given them those respective consecrated charters, in order to keep them the longer under the British subjection. If the Colonies had no such charters given them, it was well understood, that the Americans would the sooner look into the rights of human nature, would the sooner look into the rights of the British constitution; and of consequence would the sooner get emancipated from that odious dominion. To violate those charters, was the most idiotical stroke of politics that ever was exhibited in the life of man. I am convinced, that if those charters had remained inviolated, the Americans never would have entertained the most distant notion of a separation from the mother country.—To secure peace, tranquility, affection, and a mutual intercourse between Great Britain and the Colonies, the Americans would
clear-

clearly assent to the re-establishment of the political and commercial connexion, upon the old foundation. Yet, in my opinion, such a connexion is not the most eligible to the human mind. But rather than submit to the British Ministry, or a British Parliament, in their former or present arbitrary and despotic proceedings, the Americans will chuse to exist or breathe independent of the common country, tho' civil war and blood-shed were to be held in perpetual prospect.

The Gentlemen have relied a great deal upon that popular argument of *parent and child*; by way of illustration between Great Britain and America. If the Gentlemen were philosophers, they would readily see that this was a most deceitful method of reasoning. The connexion between a parent and a child is a natural connexion. It results from a certain compacted association of ideas. The chain is simple; it consists only of one link; there is nothing intermediate; the imagination has no room to wander; the mind is tied down to the two objects before it. It is a natural connexion; and therefore cannot be broken. But it is

is not so with Great Britain and America : America was first taken possession of, was first cultivated with the industry, the riches, and the blood of the first settlers. Parliament had nothing to do in the matter. The Colonies consist of a vast variety of different nations, who have emigrated from every different part of Europe. I doubt whether the King is lord paramount of the soil ; the lands are subject to the laws of occupancy ; it is a new world. Here that natural connexion does not subsist ; that certain compacted association of ideas does not take place ; the chain is not simple ; it is a compound chain ; it consists of many links ; there is something intermediate ; the imagination has room to wander ; the mind is not tied down to the two objects before it. The connexion is not a natural connexion ; it is an artificial connexion, and therefore may be broken upon any just occasion. The argument is not applicable ; the illustration intended by it is unphilosophical.

The Gentleman upon my right hand has endeavoured to ridicule the Americans upon their practice of *slavery* in that country.

I hope

I hope the Gentleman did not do it according to the best of his abilities—I hope we shall have a better specimen of those abilities upon some other examination. Sir, the Americans are fully sensible of the unhappy predicament in which they stand upon that point. They have resolved to purchase no more of those Negro slaves. There is a plan in agitation to set even those free who are already in their possession—Either to let them return to their native country if they chuse it, or to make them tenants of the lands which their masters at present occupy. However, Sir, the Americans are not totally to blame even in this instance. It is the English Parliament and the English merchants, who are answerable for this defect in colonisation. They first sent Negro slaves to that insulted country; they first introduced that baneful importation; which has now become a practice, a trafic, and a habit not easily to be removed. The Americans acknowledge the slave trade to be barbarous and inhuman. They acknowledge it inconsistent that free Americans should hold in slavery. Their ideas are

now expanded, not only upon that subject, but upon all others. Necessity may compel them to retain the number of Negroes that are already introduced for a little time, but that period will be of short duration. Even emigration will very soon settle that important point.

The Gentleman upon my left hand seems to pride himself considerably upon the *Indian* argument. I must observe to him, in the first place, that he is now involved in a most deplorable situation. If he supports the legislative supremacy of the British Parliament over the people of America, he must then admit that the *extirpation* of the Indians, as he is pleased to call it, was the operation of the English Parliament from the beginning. If he denies that it was the operation of the English Parliament from the beginning, then the conclusion will evidently follow, that the British Parliament cannot be supreme over those people who did extirpate the Indians. Besides, Sir, every man must know that the population of the earth, the cultivation of a new desert world, the welfare of the general society, the propagation

gation of a one supreme God, and the inculcation of the Christian religion, are sufficient motives to restrict a barbarous and savage set of people to a particular region upon that extensive continent—A region that is unknown in its dimensions, and must contain ten thousand times a greater quantity of lands than ever they can possibly make use of—and lands much richer and much better calculated for their way of life, the original state of hunting, than any they have left behind them in the lower parts of the country. But indeed the truth of the matter is, that most of these lands, now in the possession of the British inhabitants, have been *bought* from the Indians. They were not taken from them by force of arms: the original inhabitants have not been extirpated. The word extirpation is a very improper term to make use of upon this occasion. I wish the Gentlemen who speak in this Society would confine themselves to truth and to matters of fact. To my knowlege things that are spoken here have been carried into private companies, and from thence to the ears of the Minister. To offer affer-

tions as positive matter of veracity, in a contention so important, where the principal party is absent, and only a few individuals to defend their cause, is savage, impious, and abominable.

Let me now examine the important argument of *protection*; taken in the popular acceptation of the word. It is upon this argument of protection, and the fanciful *dignity* of Parliament, that fire and sword are sent like a deluge to every corner of associating America. The Americans want no protection at the expence of liberty. They would rather be totally extirminated than breathe under so wretched an existence. However, Sir, in return for this protection they give you the very great advantages of their extensive commerce—They feed every rank of people in Great Britain, Ireland, and the West Indies—Many millions are subsisted entirely by them. The landed properties are more than quadrupled by that connexion. The navy of England, and the land army of Great Britain are in a chief manner supported by their beneficial commerce—And by them the dignity and importance of the British empire are extend-

portanc

ed throughout the world. There is not a planter or farmer in North America that does not pay at least ten times the taxes that the inhabitants of Great Britain do. —Not indeed under the express denomination of taxes ; but they pay them in substance ; they pay them in money, or they pay them in the produce of the country. They maintain their own internal list ; they support their own civil establishments. There is not an article of British manufacture that goes from this country, that does not, upon an average with the other articles, bear at least 250 per cent. when sold to the British Americans. And the Americans are obliged to purchase them, because they are so restricted by the British legislature, that they cannot purchase them elsewhere. The Americans are willing to tax themselves in proportion to their respective abilities—And they are willing that the produce of such a taxation should be applied by Parliament to the alleviation of the national debt *. But they will not submit to be O'Connor'd. In my opinion, this concession from Ame-

* This proceeded upon the supposition, that Lord Chatham's *Plan* was dictated by the American Agents.

rica is going to that length which can never be justified to posterity upon the principles of prudence. It is too great a surrender, to tax themselves upon the full amount of their respective abilities; and at the same time to be confined and restricted in all their trade and navigation by the Parliament of Great Britain. This concession will not operate as a future encouragement to the Colonies. It may be productive of many subsequent acts of oppression.—But all these weighty considerations are not enough; the colonies must be taxed at pleasure by unlimited authority. The royal confidence and their own solemn charters must be totally annihilated. They must become perfect slaves. If the Americans would condescend to pay off the national debt; if they would condescend to discharge all the annual taxes arising in Great Britain; if they would condescend to fatten a whole legion of hungry dependents; then perhaps the Americans might be admitted to the *privileges* of British subjects. Sir, the Americans are not protected merely because they are British subjects; they are protected upon these grand considerations resulting

sulting from self-interest—Upon the extensive and beneficial advantages of their commerce and seamen—Upon the dignity and importance, they communicate to the British empire in every part of the globe—And upon the fear and danger of their falling into the hands of some other power, who in consequence of such an acquisition might discompose the balance of European politics. If the Colonies were useless or burdensome to the mother country, the unnatural parent would very hastily withdraw that protection, which she now magnifies in all the pomp and strains of theatrical declamation. It is the ruling principle of self-interest, it is that ruling principle which has made her act the part she has hitherto done—I fear it is the damnable and damned principle of despotic power that pushes on the present inhuman proceedings.

The Gentleman has said, that if we had not protected the Colonies, they would have fallen into the hands of *France*. Suppose they had. If that Gentleman was acquainted with historical records, he would know that the Colonies of free states

states have always been more uniformly oppressed than the Colonies of a pure monarchy, or even despotism itself. I make no doubt the Americans would rather be subject to the uncontrolled dominion of a king of France, among a sensible and polite people, than be subject to the uncontrolled dominion of an unconfined Aristocracy, in a land overflowing with villany and corruption.

The honour and dignity of the Parliament, the honour and dignity of the British nation have been thundered out this evening. To answer this argument in its full extent, we must have recourse to the whole of the preceding disquisition. I have vindicated the Americans in their present resistance even to mathematical demonstration. I have proved to conviction that the inhabitants of the British Colonies are only contending for their constitutional rights and liberties—Are contending for the inviolation of their solemn charters and the royal confidence. I have proved that their present opposition originally took place from an arbitrary, unlimited, and undefined taxation—And I have

have proved that the Americans are acting and contesting upon the genuine principles of the British constitution. I never knew that the honor and dignity of a Parliament, that the honor and dignity of the British nation consisted, or could ever be preserved by injustice, by violence, and by oppression. I am afraid the honor and dignity of the British nation have long ago been sacrificed. Both friends and enemies feel the change. If the honour and dignity of the Parliament could ever be retrieved, it would be in doing ample justice to American virtue.

The Gentleman below me has made some observations upon the *charitable assistance* which was given by the Colonies to the unfortunate Bostonians. In contradiction to the Gentleman, I think it is the most glorious monument of the god-like principle that ever was recorded in the annals of history. It was supreme benevolence in the Colonies to give all the assistance to the distressed Bostonians, compatible with the extent of their fortunes and abilities. They considered the miserable situation of that devoted town as de-

Demanding

manding the most speedy and effectual relief. They felt the dictates of humanity ; they felt a brotherly affection. He must have a base-born soul who would not comply with so noble, so transcendent a requisition.

The North Briton at the farther end of the room has endeavoured to create a *division* among the Colonies. He has made the foundation of his argument to lean upon such a division—And to do him justice, he has raised a very ingenious super-structure upon that foundation. However, Sir, I cannot agree with him in his principles of *Adelphi* building. He has taken the premises for granted, and drawn the most logical conclusions. I shall strike at the very root of his argument. I will not fatigue myself to lop off the branches. —I say there is not, and in my opinion never will be a division among the associating Colonies of North America. The affair of *New York* does not deserve a serious refutation. The fact has been misrepresented. We know that there are some ministerial hirelings in the city of *New York*. Unfortunately for the reputation

tation of that province, most of those hirelings have been squeezed into the present assembly. Let us prophesy what a new assembly will bring forth. Not a man of them will be elected again. The people are unanimous throughout the whole province to support the resolutions of the Continental Congress. Even those very ministerial hirelings are at length satisfied, that the Parliament of Great Britain have no right to tax the Colonies; and that the late proceedings of the British Parliament are not warrantable upon the principles of the British constitution. Accordingly they have drawn up a *Petition to the King*, a *Memorial to the Lords*, and a *Remonstrance to the House of Commons*. The present commercial stratagem will not answer the Minister's purpose.—The Americans think that the town of Boston and the Colony of Massachusett's Bay are now suffering in the common cause of North America. They think that the late unjustifiable acts of Parliament, relative to the town of Boston and their sister Colony of Massachusetts, are unconstitutional, arbitrary, and oppressive. They

are determined to assist each other, and will never be separated. They knew that an act of oppression, directed to any one of the British Colonies in America, is an act directed against the whole. They know that there is a natural and political obligation incumbent upon every such Colony to consider the late cruel and destructive proceedings against the town of Boston, the province of Massachusetts, and the rest of New England, as directed in progression to each particular establishment. I am convinced there will be preserved a firm and substantial union and association among all the Colonies of British America. I am sure there is, and ever will be, among those people courage, firmness, resolution, unanimity, and affection. Neither too tame under the false idea of moderation, nor hurried on by passions disallowable. An alliance entered into upon their principles, and their motives of acting, will be, must be lasting and effectual. It is observed by the prince of orators, " that where affection joins, and one common interest animates the confederating powers, there " the

“ the alliance is never to be shaken.” In the history of mankind there never was known a greater unanimity and affection than subsist at present through every part of associating America. The inhabitants of that vast continent look upon this trying period as the most noble struggle for the rights and liberties of a free-born people. The Genius of England has crossed the Atlantic, and animates the bosom of the Western world. They are prepared and determined to resist. They will never give up their cause. They will contend to the latest extremity. Their country may be drowned in blood, but their spirit never will be vanquished.—The laws of nature and the constitution have allotted every individual a certain station for the good of his country, whether that individual be the highest or the lowest in the community. A man that will not obey such allotment, but acts in opposition to the good of his country, or even remains negative when the good of his country is at stake, ought certainly to be held among the worst and basest of mankind—And in my opinion, whatever Colony or person

shall

shall dare to abandon the station assigned them by the laws of freedom for the welfare of America, should from thenceforward be deemed infamous eternally, and unworthy to inhabit a land distinguished for patriotism, for civil and religious liberty.

It is said this evening, that Lord North has in some measure given up the grand point of *taxation*. I am always ready to do justice to this Lordship's humanity. Perhaps he may seriously wish for an honourable accommodation. But my Lord North has most egregiously mistaken the road to arrive at it. The present commercial proceedings do not carry the aspect of amicable reconciliation. The Colonies are not to be intimidated. A continuation and succession of oppressions will only serve to exasperate them the more. All the grievances complained of from the Continental Congress, and all the subsequent proceedings of Parliament should have been suspended in their operation, till the Americans had positively refused to impose a self-taxation. I imagine the Americans will look upon the celebrated

motion

motion of my Lord North as nothing more than a ministerial manœuvre to *divide and govern*. It is intended also to stupify the people of Great Britain. The Americans must be put upon their guard. It will do them no detriment to keep a watchful eye to the preservation of their liberties. I am unable to discover what mighty advantages the Colonies can possibly derive from this magnificent motion of the noble Lord. "We are told that the Colonies are left at full liberty to tax themselves." And yet the produce of such a taxation must meet with the *approbation* of the British Parliament; and the total amount of such taxation be subjected to the *unlimited disposition* of that Parliament. Here is only a mere change of words. The right and the substance of American taxation are as much asserted and retained by the present proposition, as they could have been by the most positive and direct act of Parliament whatever. Without some more substantial modification of the prevailing idea to tax themselves, the Americans will never accede to the wished-for accommodation with the mother country. Why should they, Sir ?

They

They have many bright examples to illuminate the path before them. They have arms and ammunition in a great abundance. They have many able and experienced commanders. They have men with hugh strength of body, and who bear the hearts of lions. They have the best troops in the world for an American war; hardy and intrepid; they are brought up to difficulties, and they fear no danger. But above all, Sir, they have a title built upon that foundation, *against which the gates of DESPOTISM can never prevail.*

The Gentlemen have made great use of *suppositions* this evening. It is something wonderful that fanciful cases and the flights of imagination should be made use of, should be even tolerated in an argument and a matter of the first importance. It is a strong presumption how miserably they are pinched for somewhat better. But their suppositions continue as distant from matters of fact, as their unnatural and sophisticated discourses are from the dictates of humanity and from solid argument. Let the Gentlemen suppose the immaculated *submission* of pusillanimous America.

America. I allow the Gentlemen to enjoy that original idea. The Americans hold, and they hold justly, that a bloody independence is a more desirable situation to a generous-thinking mind, than the most slender submission of a free-born people to an arbitrary, unlimited, and undefined taxation.

Before I quit the argument altogether, give me leave to take some short notice of *Taxation no Tyranny*; that late anonymous publication which has been so idolized this evening. I give the writer full credit for all his pomposity. If the author was a young man, his monstrous pedantry might in some measure be entitled to an allowable extenuation. But as the author is an old man, his consummate ignorance of the British constitution ought to render him an object of contempt—Or his ministerial corruption an object of detestation. His logic is most certainly influenced by the logic of the Treasury. He reasons a good deal in conformity with Jeremiah Dyson upon the Middlesex election. The present Administration are very bountiful of the public money. How

generous it is to encircle with PROSTITUTION the brows of Mr. Johnson ! I think this pamphlet will do infinite service to the cause of America. It will shew that the argument of the Minister is completely vicious, when so bare-faced a performance could be the production of his greatest champion.—I will give you the definition of *tyranny*, according to the famous *Samuel Johnson* (a very different man from the present) in his Folio Dictionary. *Tyranny is absolute power imperiously administered.* Can any power be more absolute, can any power be more imperiously, more *authoritatively* administered, than in forcing my property from me without my consent ? No limitation, no duration prescribed. It is *tyranny* in the fullest extension of the term. The inhabitants of this country would not choose to be taxed by their *German* ancestors. The island of Great Britain is nothing more than a union of different Colonies from the neighbouring continent. Many undisputed records will tell us, that *Calais* and the *Counties Palatine* were never liable to taxation until they sent representatives

tives to the English Parliament. It was the opinion of the judges of England, in the reigns of Henry the Sixth and Richard the Third, " that a tax granted by the Parliament of England shall not bind those of Ireland, because they are not summoned to our Parliament : Ireland hath a Parliament of its own, and maketh and altereth laws, and our statutes do not bind them, because they do not send knights to our Parliament." Sir Edward Coke says, *it is against the franchises of the land for freemen to be taxed but by their own consent.* The journals of the House of Commons have resolved, *that the ancient and undoubted rights of every freeman are—that he hath a full and absolute property in his goods and estate, and cannot be taxed but by common consent.* Let us hear my Lord Chat-ham ; *you have no right to tax America—I rejoice that America has resisted—Two millions of our fellow subjects, so lost to every sense of virtue as tamely to give up their liberties, would be fit instruments to impose chains upon the rest.* What does my Lord Camden say ; *my researches have more and more convinced me, that you have no right to tax America.*

rica.—I will maintain it with my last breath —*Taxation and representation are inseparable.* But it is said that a great part of England are actually taxed by the Parliament, who are not represented in that Parliament. Suppose we grant it, does the argument apply to the present disputation? The representation in America is pretty much upon the same establishment that we find it in this country. The Americans are not contending for an alteration of the constitution—They are only contending for the enjoyment of the most essential right of the constitution, to be taxed by their representatives in the manner already established. It is a strange way of reasoning to say, that because the representation is imperfect in Great Britain, that it ought to be totally abolished in America. I might as well say, that because the representation is imperfect in that country, therefore it ought to be abolished in this.

How ridiculous it is to tell us, that because *some* individuals are taxed in Britain without their consent, therefore that *all* in America must be taxed also without their consent

consent. In Great Britain it is an easy matter for the non-electors to become electors—But it is impossible for the Americans to become electors to the British Parliament, without totally changing the nature of the question. The elected, the electors, and the non-electors, are all equally interested in the matter of taxation; they equally participate; they have all the same security. But the Americans are not equally interested, they have no such participation, they have no such security. In proportion as the Americans are burdened with taxation, in the same proportion the inhabitants of this country are lightened in taxation. It is this one consideration that makes unpopular the present resistance of North America. Is it not agreeable to the feelings of the human mind, for an individual to receive a convenient *pension* at the expence of the people? And will it not also be agreeable to those feelings, for the one people to receive emoluments, to receive exonerations at the expence of another people? A little will never satisfy. *Men will never think they have enough, when they*

*t*hey can take more; nor be content with a part, when they can seize the whole. Perhaps too the pension may be quadrupled. If the Americans were to contribute their fullest proportions to relieve the necessities of Great Britain, the mother country would never receive those proportions with any marks of gratitude or affection. Her *pride* and *brutality* do already consider them as matters of the most perfect right. In the same manner that *my* pride and *brutality* would operate in a *Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland*. The more I was relieved from the oppressions of my journey, the greater civilities I met with, and the kinder entertainment I experienced from those hospitable people, so much the less would be my gratitude, so much the more would be my encroachments, so much the greater should I consider the tributes due to my vast importance. Perhaps too, upon returning to my native country, if myself and my patrons did not receive too violent a shock from that consummate master of *political electricity*, I should devote all the faculties of my head and

and heart to abuse and misrepresent the Great American. But after all, Sir, I will readily grant there are some few touches of wit that flash out from that ministerial pamphlet. And I will readily grant also, that many of the arguments contained in that performance shine to a very great degree; but they shine as putrefaction shines

E R R A T A.

Page 21, line 7, instead of these words, *they pay them in money, or they pay them in the produce of the country*, let the following be substituted by way of erratum, *they pay them in the prodigious advantages of their exports and imports.*

Page 34, line 3 from bottom, after *Calais*, add *Wales*.

To the end add, the following is a paragraph from Johnson's journey to the western islands of Scotland, "The mountaineers having lost *that reverence for property, BY WHICH THE ORDER OF LIFE IS PRESERVED*, soon consider all as enemies whom they do not reckon as friends, and think themselves licensed to *invade* whatever they are not *obliged to protect.*" Does this accord with the doctrine of *Taxation no Tyranny?*

they can take more; nor be content with a part, when they can seize the whole. Perhaps too the pension may be quadrupled. If the Americans were to contribute their fullest proportions to relieve the necessities of Great Britain, the mother country would never receive those proportions with any marks of gratitude or affection. Her

British friends already consider

APPENDIX



country, if myself and my patrons did not receive too violent a shock from that consummate master of *political electricity*, I should devote all the faculties of my head and

and heart to abuse and misrepresent the Great American. But after all, Sir, I will readily grant there are some few touches of *wit* that flash out from that ministerial pamphlet. And I will readily grant also, that many of the arguments contained in that performance shine to a very great degree; but they shine as putrefaction shines in the dark.

F I N I S.

21113

